

He gave examples of when he would likely be involved, including situations where the staff disagrees about what policy to follow or the application of a policy in a particular decision, neither of which Babbitt was aware of during the Hudson decision-making process.<sup>420</sup> He specifically denied knowing about any disagreement among the career and political staff about the interpretation of “detriment” in Section 20, and said there was no disagreement that the application should be denied.

Babbitt said he did not know that Chairman Fowler or anyone at the DNC had expressed an interest in the Hudson casino matter prior to the time the decision was made. Babbitt said he barely knew Fowler in July 1995. Prior to the investigation of the Hudson casino application, Babbitt would have recognized Fowler as a familiar face but may not have been able to associate his name. He met Fowler in 1987 or 1988 in connection with Democratic politics. He did not see him again until Fowler was named Chairman of the DNC. While he was DNC Chairman, Babbitt said he would see Fowler infrequently at political functions. He said during the 1995-96 election cycle, he had no discussions about fund-raising with Fowler, nor about anything Fowler wanted from Babbitt or the Department. Babbitt said also that prior to the Hudson decision, he had “zero” direct contacts with Clinton/Gore ‘96.<sup>421</sup> He added that he expects that some people from those organizations were arranging his campaign schedule, but those people did not contact

---

<sup>420</sup> Although these matters did not involve internal policy disputes or internal disagreements about the application of policy, Babbitt said he was involved to varying degrees in at least three Indian gaming matters which were pending during roughly the same time period as the Hudson application: the Pequot, Wampanoag and Sault Ste. Marie matters, described below at 360-63.

<sup>421</sup> OIC Babbitt Int. at 13-14.